

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO

United States of America,) Case No. CR 12 - 868 MAG
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLEDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Bittany Kirk	JAN 7 0 2013
Defendant.	RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT CAURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
by the continuance outweigh the best interest of t	ton January 10, 2012, the Court excludes time under the february, 2012 and finds that the ends of justice served he public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § I bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance wou See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ald be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
or law, that it is unreasonable to ex	lex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of e prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial shed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance wou taking into account the exercise of	ald deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance wou counsel's other scheduled case con See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	ld unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given nmitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance woul necessary for effective preparation, See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	ld unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 1/10/12	
	LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney